

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 4, 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-10 were rejected. Additionally, claims 3 and 5-7 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, claims 11-13 were allowed. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, proposed amendments are presented for new claims 14-18. In particular, claim 14 is presented to recite the limitations of claim 4 and depend from allowed claim 11. Claim 15 is presented to recite the limitations of claim 7 and depend from allowed claim 12. Claim 16 is presented to recite the limitations of claim 8 and depend from allowed claim 11. Claim 17 is presented to recite the limitations of claim 9 and depend from allowed claim 11. Claim 18 is presented to recite the limitations of claim 10 and depend from allowed claim 11. These proposed amendments are supported, for example, by claims 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively. Consequently, claims 1-10 are canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 3 and 5-7 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 3 and 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant submits that the objection to claims 3 and 5-7 are moot in light of the proposed cancellation of claims 1-10.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Doescher (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0149358, hereinafter Doescher). Additionally, claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doescher. Additionally, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doescher. Additionally, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doescher. Additionally, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doescher. Applicant submits that the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-10 are moot in light of the proposed cancellation of claims 1-10.

New Claims

The new claims 14-18 depend from the allowed independent claims 11 and 12. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 14-18 are patentable over and not anticipated by the cited references at least because the base claims, claims 11 and 12, are allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 18, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111